

REMARKS

I. Introduction

By the present Amendment, claim 2 has been amended, and claims 4 and 9 canceled. Accordingly, claims 5-8 remain pending in the application.

II. Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank Examiners Hetul B. Patel and Matthew D. Anderson for the courtesy and cooperation extended during the interview conducted on December 20, 2005.

During the interview, the language of the claims and the meaning of the word "eccentricity" within the optical media art were discussed, as well as the differences between the claimed invention and Stebbings. Independent claim 4 was discussed at length. Applicants' representative explained to the Examiners the differences between conventional methods of generating authentication keys and the method defined in the claims. Specifically, it was indicated that the claims of the invention generate the authentication key based on an offset between the center of rotation of the disk and the geometric center of the disk. This particular characteristic is defined as eccentricity. By using the eccentricity characteristics of the disk, it becomes difficult to duplicate the authentication key because each disk has a relatively unique eccentricity characteristic that falls within acceptable tolerances of the manufacturing process for the disk. Applicants' representative further indicated that when combined with the eccentricity characteristics of the

spindle motor, it becomes even more difficult to reproduce the authentication key using both a different disk and a different drive.

The definition of the term "eccentricity" was also discussed at length. Applicants' representative explained that the meaning was well known, and accepted, in the art. Various definitions were presented from dictionaries, the Internet, and a technical website related to optical media. It was indicated that the definition used in the optical media website was consistent with the definitions provided on the Internet as well as the dictionary. It was also indicated that the specification provides support for the claim language, as well as the definition from the optical media website, at pages 14-15 (paragraph [0034] of the published application).

The differences between the present claims and Stebbings were also discussed. Applicants' representative indicated that Stebbings did not disclose any authentication methods that take into account eccentricity characteristics, or any offsets between the geometric center and center of rotation of the disk.

It was agreed that a response would be filed to address the rejections raised in the outstanding Office action. The Examiners indicated that further searching and consideration would be necessary to assess the consistency of the definitions discussed for eccentricity and to identify the possible existence of additional prior art in view of the substance of the interview (e.g., generating authentication keys based on eccentricity). No conclusions were reached with regards to claim language or possible amendments thereto.

III. Office Action Summary

In the Office Action of November 3, 2005, claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication JP 2001-256004A to Igari in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,689 issued to Stebbings. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication JP 2001-256004A to Igari in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,046,870 issued to Karube.

The Examiner's indication that claims 5-8 are allowed is noted with appreciation.

IV. Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Igari in view of Stebbings.

The cancellation of claim 4 renders part of this rejection moot.

By the present amendment, Applicants have amended claim 2 to depend from independent claim 5, which has been allowed by the Examiner. Accordingly, claim 2 is believed to be allowable over the art of record.

Claim 9 was also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Igari in view of Karube.

The cancellation of claim 9 renders this particular ground of rejection moot.

V. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is believed in order, and courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are any matters which can be resolved by way of either a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

AUTHORIZATION

Applicants request any shortage or excess in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, and for which no other form of payment is offered, be charged or credited to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case: 500.42806X00).

Respectfully submitted,
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leonid D. Thenor', is written over a horizontal line.

Leonid D. Thenor
Registration No. 39,397

LDT/vvr
1300 N. Seventeenth Street
Suite 1800
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-312-6600
Fax: 703-312-6666

Dated: January 20, 2006